Since men are neither omniscient nor infallible, they must be free to agree or disagree, to cooperate or to pursue their own independent course, each according to his own rational judgment. Ayn Rand. Ayn Rand was a widely celebrated, worldwide bestselling American novelist originally born amongst the totalitarian communist regime of the soviet union. She is famous for her two best books, the Fountainhead and Atlas shrugged, however she is more celebrated for the creation of her moral philosophy today known as objectivism.

Good [Morning/Afternoon/Evening/Night] my name is Arjun Chopra and I stand in strong negation of the proposed resolution, Resolved: Wealthy nations have an obligation to provide developmental assistance to other nations.

Before I begin I will define my ethical value which is objectivism. “My philosophy, in essence, is the concept of man as a heroic being, with his own happiness as the moral purpose of his life, with productive achievement as his noblest activity, and reason as his only absolute.” Ayn Rand, Atlas Shrugged. Objectivism is comprised of five pillars, the first, humankind's’ relation with the universe, reality. The second, the relation of humankind with their minds is reason. Third is the ethicality of objectivism, humankind’s relation with him or herself is self interest. Fourth, humankind’s relation amongst each other is capitalism. Finally, is humankind’s relation with beauty is romantic realism, the ability for art to be interpreted with choice, such that each event is brought by choice.

Before I begin I would like to provide you with a roadmap of my introductory negation case. In order to stay true to the form of Lincoln Douglas debate I will structure my argument around my ethical framework of objectivism and its pillars. I will first address reality by placing the burden of proof, and addressing my first contention of international law under the ethical contract theory. Then I will complete adequate rebuttal proving to the judge why the affirmatives case is logically flawed, addressing the pillar of reason. Next addressing the pillar of self interest I will define the sub ethical value of the social contract theory, linking to my second contention, the state's prima facie responsibility to it citizens. Penultimately, I will address the second to final pillar of capitalism, addressing the major flaw with the resolution linking to my third contention, that by providing developmental assistance, wealthy nations are hurting other nations. Finally, I will address the basis of romantic realism, choice in my subpoint of my third contention addressing the very real possibility of neocolonization by wealthy nations of poorer nations, namely those in Africa.

Contention one: International law. Wealthy nations do not have an obligation to provide developmental assistance to anyone. By the virtue of ethical contractarianist theories, without a contract structured in international law that states such an obligation, no obligation exists. This fact cannot be debated, without an agreement of obligation, no obligation exists. Additionally, the burden of proof within this resolution is placed very clearly on the affirmative case. This is very difficult for them to do when structured around said prima facie principles of contractarianism as nowhere in international law, among the UN, the ICJ, or among any other treaties no such agreement exists and no such obligation exists. For this reason, the resolution if false.

Contention two: Wealthy nations do not have an obligation to provide developmental assistance to other nations as they have a first priority to their own citizens, and they cannot provide assistance to both their own citizens and other nations. This value is upon the basis of prima facie duty of autonomy and the deontological virtue ethics value of duty fulfillment. Here we see, similar to the theory of the invisible hand that each country, has a prima facie obligation to provide beneficence to its own citizens. What the aff will claim is that rich countries, can provide beneficence for their own citizens while also providing developmental assistance for other nations, but this isn’t true. A foreign state cannot provide for another country without taking from its citizens. Wealthy nations may have a lot of money, even so, they battle many issues of their own. In the United States one in five people experience food insecurity. The United States’ economy may be a quarter of the global GDP, but they countries are still facing issues that they need to fix.

Contention three: Capitalism and choice. Subpoint one: Governance. When applying the philosophy to the resolution we can see why the resolution is not true. In capitalist democracy, the leader of a country has a primary responsibility to their citizens. The leader must allow for the country to grow economically in order to pull its people out of poverty. When rich countries provide developmental assistance to other nations, they take the reliance of leaders from their people and give it to rich countries. This change in reliance means that dictatorship can grow. By giving aid to impoverished areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa, wealthy nations are also crushing emerging economies under their heavy feet. To visualize this I will provide an example used often by one of the top African economists, Dambisa Moyo. She explains that when we provide goods for free such as mosquito nets, we prevent small businesses from growing as we steal their customers. This may seem like a lesser evil, but by keeping business from growing and keeping dictators in power, we prevent poor nations from rising up, we prevent them from accessing and utilizing their own resources. This keeps emerging economies from rising up, this keeps people in poverty, and this promotes a never ending cycle of dependence. As wealthy nations grow their economies, poor emerging economies remain stagnant, when accounting for inflation, they are actually becoming poorer.

Subpoint two: Neocolonization. Many claim that an imminent threat of neocolonization is a stretch, but it is becoming more and more imminent. Wealthy nations will become more powerful, having large economies and armed forces and other nations are reliant on aid and military intervention. By keeping poor nations reliant on these necessities they become slaves to wealthy nations on the world stage. Don’t believe me, take a look at the stunt president Trump pulled in December. When a resolution was brought to the General Assembly to condemn the United States for interfering in a foreign country’s affairs, Trump alluded to withdrawing aid from countries that vote for said resolution. In 2017, the US tried to buy its way out of justice, what happens when aid is increased. This divide is growing, four countries control fifty percent of the world economy, and the divide will only become larger and larger until wealthy nations will hold other nations on leashes using the threat to withdraw funding. How is this a moral or even ethical end to this resolution. It isn’t. Romantic Realism places above all other values the value of freedom. This resolution crushed that value.

For the aforementioned reasons, because the resolution, Resolved: Wealthy nations have an obligations to provide developmental assistance to other nations. Is false under my ethical value. Because of the logical fallacies in the aff’s case, because wealthy nations must first provide for their citizens and right now cannot do both. Because aid hurts poor nations, because of the imminent threat of neocolonization, and because of the moral superiority of my ethical value of objectivism, I implore the judges to vote a neg ballot. Thank you.